REMARKS

Applicants have canceled claims 1 and 2 and replaced these claims with new claims 42 and 43. Applicants submit that the new claim 42 complies with sections 101 and 112. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections under sections 101 and 112 of claim 1.

A.   CLAIMS 3-10, 42, AND 43 ARE ALLOWABLE OVER KEITH

Independent claim 42 is allowable over Keith. None of the cited references, including Keith, teach or suggest a method for identifying an individual's personal, human networking style. The section of Keith referenced in the Office Action (col. 16 and lines 19-62) does not teach or suggest "human networking style." In contrast to the present invention of claim 42, Keith is generally directed to a system to help a user find words that have associated meanings so that the user can readily browse through information. Basically, Keith describes an improved searching tool. Keith does not teach and is not directed to human relationships or human networking. Keith is directed to a different problem (i.e., how to efficiently search through large amounts of data) than the invention of claim 42 (assisted human networking). Thus, claim 42 is allowable over Keith.

Claim 43 is also allowable over Keith. Keith fails to teach or suggest acquiring information about a person's behaviors and characteristics in relation to human networking with other individuals. Further, Keith teaches away from the claimed invention of claim 43. Specifically, Keith teaches of data that is "not specified by human operator." (Col. 16, lines 26-27). Keith teaches of data relationships (not human relationships), where the data relationships are determined by the system and are not specified by human input. In direct contrast to Keith, claim 43 recites "acquires information about a person's attitudes, behaviors and characteristics as specified by input from a human user in relation to human networking with other individuals." Thus, Keith teaches away from the invention as defined by claim 43. Claim 43 is therefore allowable.

Claim 3 is allowable over Keith. Since independent claim 42 is allowable, each of the dependent claims is likewise allowable over the cited references. Further, the dependent claims include additional features not found in the cited references. For example, none of the cited references

U.S. App. No.: 09/781,127

teach or suggest networking frameworks for a manager's subordinates, as recited in claim 3. Claim 3 is therefore allowable.

Claims 4-10 are allowable over Keith. Since independent claim 42 is allowable, dependent claims 4-10 are also allowable.

B.   CLAIMS 15-41 ARE ALLOWABLE

Independent claim 15 is allowable over Keith in view of Atkinson. None of the cited references, including Keith, Atkinson, Hirata, Mosquera, Shah, and Megiddo, teach the specific combination as defined by claim 15. For example, none of the cited references disclose a first relationship link associated with relationship currency information with respect to a personal human relationship between the human user and the first contact. In contrast to claim 15, Keith discloses relationships between data, such as semantic and linguistic structures of words and text. Keith does not teach or suggest human relationships. Further, Keith teaches away from claim 15. Specifically, Keith teaches of data that is "not specified by human operator." (Col. 16, lines 26-27). Keith teaches of data relationships (not human relationships), where the data relationships are determined by the system and are not specified by human input. Keith teaches away from receiving a plurality of information as specified by input received from a human user, as recited by claim 15. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 15 is allowable. In addition to the above argument regarding claim 15, none of the cited references teach or suggest the additional claim features of an indication of a perceived level of mutuality (claim 17), knowledge (claim 19), or power and/or influence (claim 20).

None of the cited references disclose the specific combination of elements as defined by claim 24. For example, none of the cited references disclose a first relationship link associated with relationship currency information with respect to a personal human relationship between the human user and the first contact. Again, in contrast to claim 24, Keith discloses relationships between data, such as semantic and linguistic structures of words and text. Keith does not teach or suggest human relationships. Further, Keith teaches away from claim 24. Specifically, Keith teaches of data that is "not specified by human operator." (Col. 16, lines 26-27). Keith teaches of data relationships (not human relationships), where the data relationships are determined by the system and are not specified

by human input. Keith teaches away from inputting a plurality of information regarding a first user within an organization as specified by a human operator, as recited by claim 24. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 24 is allowable.

None of the cited references disclose the specific combination as defined by claim 29. For example, none of the cited references disclose a plurality of relationship links that provide information regarding a personal human relationship. Keith, in contrast to claim 29, discloses relationships between data, not humans. Keith does not teach or suggest human relationships. Further, Keith teaches away from claim 29. Specifically, Keith teaches of data that is "not specified by human operator." (Col. 16, lines 26-27). Keith teaches of data relationships (not human relationships), where the data relationships are determined by the system and are not specified by human input. Specifically, Keith teaches of data that is "not specified by human operator." (Col. 16, lines 26-27). Keith teaches away from providing information regarding a first person that is specified by a human operator, as recited by claim 29. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 29 is allowable.

None of the cited references disclose each of the specific combination of elements as defined by claim 39. For example, Keith fails to disclose a plurality of relationship links that provide information regarding a personal human relationship with respect to human affairs. Keith discloses relationships between data such as semantic and linguistic structures of words and text. Keith does not teach or suggest human relationships. Further, Keith teaches away from claim 39. Keith teaches away from providing information regarding a first person that is specified by a human operator, as recited by claim 39. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 39 is allowable.

Since independent claims 15, 24, 29, and 39 are allowable, dependent claims 16, 18, 21-23, and 25-41 are also allowable. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

U.S. App. No.: 09/781,127

CUSTOMER NO.
34456

If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

Applicants do not believe that any additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

_9-6-2005_
Date

Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)

U.S. App. No.: 09/781,127